DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 718 SP 028 392

AUTHOR Tripp, David H.
TITLE Teachers' Journals: An Illustrated Rationale for Teacher/Researcher Partnership in Curriculum Research.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Research; *Diaries; *Educational Researchers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

A professional journal, written by teachers and read by curriculum researchers, may help the collaborative process needed to produce effective curricula that teachers will use in their classrooms. A journal of this kind could help researchers understand teachers' thought and planning processes and why curricula may have been adapted in a special way. The journal could prove an invaluable source of data, information, and vicarious experience, increasing researchers' understanding of the classroom teaching experience. This paper illustrates the nature, scope, purposes, and outcomes of such a journal and points to some implications for both curriculum research and teacher education. (Author/CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276718

Teachers' Journals:

An Illustrated Rationale for Teacher/Researcher Partnership in Curriculum Research

David H. Tripp

Murdoch University

1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Tripp

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the AERA annual conference, San Francisco.

April, 1986

SP 028 392

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Teachers' Journal:

An Illustrated Rationale for Teacher/Researcher Partnership

David H. Tripp

Murdoch University

1986

Introduction

Like many other international visitors to this conference no doubt, I was at first rather puzzled by the substance of the reviews of the abstract I submitted to Section B. On reflection, however, they made sense, though perhaps a somewhat different sense to the authors' intentions. In a number of distinctive ways, America is said to be the most pluralistic society of our time. One aspect of this is what might be termed historical pluralism: the USA at one and the same time leads the world in both radically new futuristic developments, and in an almost equal and oppositely radical conservative response. To an outsider, it often appears that America has three groups: one going further and faster forwards than anywhere else in the world; another going further and faster backwards at the same time; with a large and very confused majority which either oscillates from one direction to the other, or just moves to California to enjoy the spectacle in its most extreme form.

Be that as it may, one does not have to subscribe to that view of this country to accept that cultural pluralism in its broadest sense, is very obvious in the construction of intellectual endeavours, and appears most saliently in a relatively new and hetrogeneous area like education. That pluralism in curriculum is demonstrated in peculiar ways, such as by the fact that different people can refer to their work with the same title, curriculum, but conceive it in such

different ways that they would each exclude the other's work from it. When the people are of different nationalities, therefore, the scope for diversity is considerably multiplied. In this case, my surprise at the reviews of my abstract was engendered by comments such as "I don't see a serious 'curriculum' connection", and recommending the placing of this presentation in section K, 'Teacher Education'. The only way in which I can account for that response, is that the reviewers are conceiving curriculum in a way that I find hard to assimilate to what I perceive to be one of the current major forward thrusts in this country. Hence my comments about cultural pluralism. I do not accept that by dealing with the professional development of teachers I am thereby not talking about curriculum: how the two areas interact is a matter of how they are defined, and with the current scope for diverse views made available by the pluralistic nature of the current state of curriculum studies, I should be able to deliver a curriculum research paper about teacher education. The reviewers were right to pick up the ambiguity, but wrong to try to resolve it. Ambiguity should not only be lived with, it should be explored and exploited. Much of what is done as curriculum impinges so directly upon teacher education that these two areas blur and fuse. I would not ask you to take such a matter for granted, however, so I want to turn first to a brief consideration of how curriculum might be defined so that the licence I take is at least seen to be rational, if not as legitimate.

The Curriculum Connection

Pinar and Grumet (1981) have given an excellent account of the emergence of the term 'curriculum' in America, and I could add nothing to their consideration of the effects of the historical events which shaped our current notions of the field. But what I would take from their account, is how somewhat arbitrary administrative decisions associated curriculum with instruction. From a mid-1980's point of view, that association seems to me to have proved exceedingly

fortuitous: it appears to have played an important part in the development of curriculum studies as a cognate field, and has led to our now being able to talk of 'curriculum' rather than 'the curriculum'. Curriculum has become less about merely the classroom realisation of syllabuses and teaching materials, having more to do with pupils' learning as a complex interaction between teachers and pupils, materials and experiences, schools and society, time, place and intent. Similarly, curriculum studies has decreased the emphasis on studying the writing of those who have provided rationales for teaching methods and subject context, to engage more in performing empirical research on the teaching/learning process.

One of the most important outcomes of this change has to do with the ideology of schooling: although 'the curriculum' as content prescriptions always could, and often did quite unashamedly make a virtue of partiality, the process of instruction, was, by intent or default and until quite recently, taken to be essentially neutral, one form being seen as merely more or less efficient than another (Marsh & Stafford, 1984). It is by the coupling of instruction with curriculum that the ideology so obvious in the latter, was also detected in the former. If that important paradigm shift was initially associated with Jackson (1968), and others who followed his work into the mysteries of the "hidden curriculum", it has since been taken up with an even greater impact upon curriculum studies by predominantly social theorists of education, such as Michael Apple, Rachael Sharp, Ulf Lundgren, Henry Giroux, Stan Aaronowitz and many others.

It is partly through heeding the messages in that work about power and ideological structures operating in classrooms, partly through long and bitter experience, that teacher educators have had to admit that what is learned by pupils in school is not primarily determined by the substantive content of what it is that is selected to be officially taught. Those who I see as being the cutting

edge of curriculum studies (which may not include all the reviewers of Section B papers!) now appear to have moved to a position where they recognise that, important though prescribed learnings are in terms of the agendas they set, and the determinations they generate and maintain (Goodson, 1985) the social situatedness of the learning and personal qualities of the teacher so mediate the learning encounter that outcomes often bear very little relation to the intent. It is for such reasons that Willis' (1978) "lads" would not learn the climatic regions of South America if offered the opportunity to do so; they would learn instead merely that they could not learn, and that their locus of power lay in withdrawing their "will to learn", thereby proving the teachers incompetent.

Teachers, not being slow learners either, have always demonstrated similar sources of power. The work of Joseph Schwab, surely one of the great teacher educators of our time, is centrally located in 'curriculum', and the work he initiated on the arts of "the practical" is based on the recognition that who or what teachers are is the fundamental determiner of what is learned. It was from such a viewpoint that he recently wrote:

> ...Teachers will not and cannot be merely told what to do. Subject specialists have tried it. Their attempts and failures I know at first hand. Administrators have tried it. Legislators have tried it. Teachers are not, however, assembly line operators, and will not so behave. Further, they have no need, except in rare instances, to fall back on defiance as a way of not heeding. There are a thousand ingenious ways in which commands on what and how to teach can, will, and must be modified or circumvented in the actual moments of teaching. Teachers practise an art. Moments of choice of what to do, how to do it, with whom and at what pace, arise hundreds of times a school day, and arise differently every day and with every group of students. No command or instruction can be so formulated as to control that kind of artistic judgement and behaviour, with its demand for frequent, instant choices of ways to meet an ever varying situation.

Garth Boomer (1984), in another quite different context, has said much the same kind of thing, as have many others including myself (Tripp, 1984). More recently, I have attempted to incorporate my understanding of what curriculum

means to me in a working definition of the term. At present the following seems to summarise the view I shall adopt in this paper:

> The school curriclum is the structure of pupils' school learning. It consists of a systematic set of relations between particular people, objects, events and circumstances. As such it is the enactment of specific social practices, which may be described as: who? does what, with what and how? when, where and why? In terms of control, the curriculum is primarily vested in the consciousness, values and beliefs of individual teachers, and their interaction with the social and material situatedness of their teaching.

I have offered my own definition because it is necessary for me to articulate as succinctly as I can, the position from which I am approaching the topic of teachers' journals. On the other hand, using my own definition of something as contentious as curriculum is perhaps rather risky if not unfortunate here, because the bounds of time and relevance prevent my glossing or justifying such a personal definition. Suffice it for me here merely to reiterate and underline the key premises of my understanding of curriculum: curriculum is about what is learned in school; it is systematic and rule governed; it is a social process; and teachers are its principal agents.

Whilst it is always difficult to attribute precisely all the influences that there have been on ones thinking, major influences are usually obvious: and if I could cite but one on my thinking about the nature of curriculum as a discipline, it would have to be the late Lawrence Stenhouse. Consider the following:

> ...a curriculum may be said to be an attempt to define the common ground shared by those teachers who follow it. Although it may at times be useful to think of it as the offering to pupils, we must always bear in mind that any similarity between the offering in one classroom and another, in one school and another, must begin in the like-mindedness of teachers...
>
> Stenhouse (1977)

Without here debating issues such as the respects in which teachers need to be like-minded to produce what similarities in their teaching, or where that like-mindedness comes from and how it is reproduced, one can see that at least one British tradition in curriculum placed the consciousness of the teacher at the centre of what is learned in school, even if it was essentially a consciousness which legitimated the parameters set by the 'given' nature of much of the content and teaching processes of the traditional curriculum. Like Giroux (1981), I am convinced that the possibilities of systemic change and the scope for personal action within school systems, are greater than generally realized. And like Stenhouse, I believe that systems can be changed by changed persons.

That brings us to another aspect of Stenhouse's work in curriculum: the nexus between thought and action, which was succinctly expressed in a slogan one often heard in Britain in the early 1970's: "Curriculum change means teacher change". Since then that issue has been persued in a number of different ways, most obviously as a discussion in the journals about theory and practice in curriculum. Contrary to the tradition which dichotomises the two on largely philosophical grounds (Cherryholmes, 1985), which has been equally pervasive and powerful on both sides of the Atlantic, Stenhouse saw the two as mutually developing: "A new curriculum expresses ideas in terms of practice and disciplines practice by ideas.". And it was in practising such ideals that the British (and thereby the more recent Australian) development of Lewin's (1946) and Corey's (1949) early work action research occurred. This tradition, particularly under the influence of the "Deakin Group" of action researchers (see Grundy and Kemmis, 1981; Carr and Kemmis, 1983) would agree with Stenhouse's statement on ideas and practice, and I would urge that the opposite should also be true: "Curriculum expresses practice in terms of ideas, and disciplines ideas by practice." It is such a tradition of what curriculum research and theory could and should be about, that is the basis of the work I discuss below.

Finally by way of introduction, it seems to me that, because one of the hallmarks of curriculum is that it must be a valuable field of public and theoretical knowledge, any consideration of teachers' practice must move both itself and teachers beyond the private concerns and contingencies of the practice of individuals, to the macro-concerns of the field itself. But there must also be a reciprocal process if the field is to utilise and address the concerns of teachers: curriculum should include, engage with and explain teachers' practice. Recently there have been some excellent facilatory developments in enabling teachers better to understand the macro-processes of their teaching such as Giroux's (1983) and Goodson and Ball's (1984). But the understanding of the micro-processes of individual teachers seems only to progress in geological time, and generally, in the absence of the teachers themselves (Gough, 1984).

Even when academics do lament the lack of knowledge about, for instance, 'teachers' work' (Connell, 1985) or how teachers 'make rather than take ... the curriculum' (Woods, 1985), they still use teachers as sources of data, rather than as partners. Even Berlak and Berlak's (1981) work was essentially observational. Perhaps the most seminal attempts at such a partnership was Elliott and Adleman's Ford-T project (1976), but although that work has continued in one form or another, it has never had the institutional support necessary to make it a major force in the field. And, interestingly, the Australian action research work emanating from Deakin University (Carr and Kemmins, 1983) specifically moved away from the idea of an equal researcher-teacher partnership towards teacher directed (individually or group) work <u>facilitated</u> by an outside expert, thus shifting the balance of power to the teacher, rather than to a symmetrical partnership.

So I have set out to address two related issues in this brief paper: I want to make a 'first draft' case for using teachers' journals to link the fields of teacher education and curriculum together at both macro- and micro-levels, and in so

doing form a close working partnership between teachers and researchers, each experts in their complementary fields

Teacher Journals: Purpose/s

The journal of a classroom teacher serves different purposes for different audiences. In my work there are three principal audiences: the teacher, myself and other students in the group. It is the first two of these purposes which concern us in this paper. I have already begun to explore how I as a curriculum researcher and teachers as developing professionals use journals in other conference papers, so I will merely summarise the arguments of those papers here in order to provide a starting point from which to suggest how the two purposes could and should relate. With regard to teachers' use of journals, I suggested (Tripp, 1984), that one of the occupational hazards of being a successful teacher in a system in a relatively steady-state period, was to become captured by ones own routines. Although these routines are essential, when they dominate they can often become dysfunctional. To keep them successful it is necessary to challenge the way teaching is thought about and the techniques used, and practice must be monitored in order to act strategically. The purpose of this challenge is not only to increase a practitioners' understanding of their teaching, and use that understanding to increase the control they have over their routines, but also to develop a wider, socially informed and critical view of their teaching. Hence the title of that paper: 'From autopilot to critical consciousness'. As the earlier paper shows, keeping a professional journal is one powerful way of increasing understanding.

So, with regard to researchers' purposes for teacher journals, one at least should be obvious: as a researcher, I find them an invaluable source of data, information and vicarious experience. These last two not only increase my

understanding of classroom teaching, but can be used directly in the further development of research strategies by, for instance, the production of papers such as this. But another important purpose which I am presently working on, is the use of teacher journal entries in the generation of the grounded theory of curriculum (Tripp, 1986). Although I have little to show by way of results at present, I have tried to show some of the enormous potential of this last purpose, a topic to which I will return below.

The reason that I attach so much importance to an adequate grounded theory of education springs from another dimension of the argument about the nature of curriculum knowledge. I believe that teachers are largely excluded from the field by virtue of the constituitive knowledge interests (Habermas, 1972) of the majority of those in positions of power in the field. My 1984 paper was an intentional attack upon people who occupy curriculum positions but whose aliegiance is actually to other fields. This problem can, I think, be traced back to the view encapsulated by Westbury and Steiner (1971) as the process of curriculum inquiry including the study of subject, student, teacher and milieu. By omitting questions of the purposes and interests of the study and studiers, that view fails to securely define the field, allowing other disciplines to appropriate the resources of the field for their own interests and purposes. What we end up with in curriculum therefore, mainly accounts of macro-social processes, understandings of children as children, etc., which inform academics in the 'parental disciplines' of sociology, psychology, measurement, and so on, but do not theorise the practical matters that are of vital interest to teachers, such as the constraints on their action, or children as classroom learners. That imbalance becomes imperialistic when the former displaces the latter.

For an academic working in curriculum the prime purpose of teacher journals as a research strategy, is precisely to redress such imbalances - to shift

the knowledge interests of teachers nearer to the centre of curriculum studies This paper includes that purpose.

The Teacher Journal: Definition

First, it is not always recognised in educational research that journals have an excellent pedigree as a valued research strategy in other fields. Not only have journals provided an essential data base for later researchers who examine the records (such as historians of knowledge), but in many branches of what may loosely be termed "naturalistic research", they are the only technique which even vaguely represents an "instrument". Amongst such can be counted anthropologists, clinical psychologists and certain kinds of ethnographers. In almost all branches of research, journals are used as adjuncts to other means of data recording and analysis. One not only finds them kept by other clinical and field workers such as zoologists, cartographers, archeologists and sociologists, but also by physicists, mathematicians, linguists and medics. In spite of the ubiquity of this form of research instrument, to date I can find no authoritative text on journal writing, as opposed to record keeping, which is well covered in the methodological literature (Webb, et al., 1966; Bogdan and Taylor, 1975; Denzin, 1970; Walker, 1985; for instance). Yet, because journals include record, response and analysis, they need to be constructed differently from mere records, and there probably also need to be different kinds of journal appropriate to different fields of inquiry.

Because we seem to know so little about journals, even defining precisely what one is becomes difficult. One finds, for instance, nine definitions of the word 'journal' in the Oxford dictionary. Nevertheless, I am sure that everyone knows one when they see one, and would probably feel able to judge its quality too. So, rather than try to provide some kind of a water-tight definition of a

journal, or in this case a teacher journal, in a few sentences, I propose to illustrate, through a few examples of journal entries, some points concerning the major argument of this paper: that journals have an important part to play in curriculum research, and that in so doing teacher development may be simultaneously and mutually beneficially advanced.

Journal entries and the raising of research questions

First then, a very obvious application of journals, is the raising and identification of new research questions and the redirection of existing ones. When I began to use the journal with in-service teachers in 1980, it was so that the teachers could identify problems and issues of relevance and interest to themselves, so that I could then direct them to existing research literature where I assumed that they would find some ideas, if not answers. What happened, however, was that teachers constantly produced problems or aspects of issues that were important to them, but about which there was very little, poor quality or no published research. Educational researchers, as Bassey (1980) has shown, tend to answer researchers' rather than teachers' questions. The first two examples discussed, therefore illustrate the kind of topic about which teachers would like some well researched suggestions if not possible answers.

> It may not seem like it, but I do really like my class. I expect to have some problems, but they offer a challenge. I get to school between 7.30 and 7.45 a.m. so that I can get my board work done, sheets run off etc; so that when the children start arriving, I am free to talk to them, and see news items etc.
>
> Today I was shown a mouse in oil (it had fallen into Mum's caraffe of cooking oil and had lain on my Daily Work Pad, a pair of duck's feet!! My reaction was one of horror, and the congregation of small faces that gathered to watch my reaction was one of delight.
>
> I asked myself the question - why do the children like to show me the unusual? Is it because they already know what my reaction will be, or is it that they like to "share" their discoveries with me?

> What would happen, if I didn't allow myself the time before school, to listen to the children? Would the feeling of empathy vanish? How would the children regard me then - just a teacher teaching and no longer a person, friend, confidante ....?
>
> I would like to see research done, to find out if the time before school begins, adds to the atmosphere and classroom climate.

In many ways this is a very vague but straightforward entry: a teacher musing about one of her routines. On the other hand, the question of the way in which how a teacher structures contact with pupils in other than formal teaching situations effects other aspects of her teaching, is surely a topic of major importance. It is also one about which very little has been written. Clearly there are a number of difficulties in doing the kind of controlled research into this topic that would enable one to gain access to conventional sources of funds and publication. Most of the literature which we found on this topic was either about classroom climate in terms of the instructional moment, or based on the commonsensical notion that knowing more about ones pupils through contact outside formal lessons would enable one to respond to or deal with pupils in lessons more appropriately.

But just how complex that idea turns out to be in practice was made very obvious to me in one of my studies of a senior high school in Western Australia (Fensham et al., 1986). In that case, I found a pupil who, on first interview said that a particular teacher was a really "great bloke"; but the same pupil said in a second interview that the same teacher was "a real bastard". When I confronted her with her two quite different opinions about the same person, she said "Yeah, well that was at camp, but at school he's quite different". And it became apparent that this teacher's behaviour at camp where he sang songs and played games with them bore so little relation to his classroom behaviour that she could have quite opposite but not conflicting judgements about him, because in different situations he behaved as if he were a different person. Connell (1985) reported a

similar finding. Would the same discontinuity apply in this case, or would this teacher's time with the children before school carry over into the way in which they treated her and she them in class learning time? If the same relationship continued from one situation to the other, then I would suggest that it was because this teacher was empathic towards the students and ran a particular kind of class, that the students come to her before school with their news and surprises, not the other way around.

Answers to such questions could lead to a restructuring of the school day, but if there are well researched answers available, it is not a well known literature. The point about the journal is that whilst I had written up the research interview two years previously, it was for me merely a matter of interest that pupils' judgements of their teachers could vary so much according to the different times and different places in which they encountered their teachers. It was the 'commonplace', almost 'trivial' observation of the teacher that raised the important curriculum question to which my 'research finding' could be brought to bear. It is surprising how often the "I wonder ..." items found in teachers' journals actually raise serious and pressing questions that researchers, from their stance could never recognise.

The point about that entry is that, whilst I had written up my research report more than two years previously, it had remained for me merely a matter of academic interest that pupils' experience of (and hence judgements about) their teachers varied so much according to the context in which they interacted. I wrote, of course, things such as that, although the schools camps were beneficial to staff-pupil relations, staff could not assume transfer from one situation to another, but it was the casual, almost random, reflection of a teacher about her practice that raised the question that had more obvious and serious curriculum consequences for schools. We know from recent work in the sociology of science,

that the context in which questions are raised, and the knowledge, interests and purposes of the questioner, determine the direction of the research. So questions about practice coming from practitioners are very likely to be quite different from questions about practice which come from academics and outsiders. Journals are one very obvious and simple strategy for researchers to access or elicit teachers' questions.

It does not follow, however, that because teachers should raise more of the questions about teaching addressed by research, that teachers should also research the answers. Researchers are generally much better placed and equipped to do so: raising questions and providing data is nonetheless, one obvious role for teachers in the building of effective teacher-researcher partnerships.

The other side of that partnership, however, is the role of the researcher in finding things in teachers' entries which the teachers do not see for themselves. It is surprising, for instance, how often teachers reveal the structures of schooling in their entries without apparently seeing them as such - perhaps it is a case of 'not seeing the forest for the trees'. That phenomenon is, of course, hardly surprising, because underlying structures are endemic. The example of "manners" below is one illustration. But less frequently, entries reveal less obvious underlying structures of other things, such as teacher constructs about pupil-pupil relationships which can alert researchers to possible discrepancies in, or alternative readings of, the literature:

> Merrilee has returned from illness and appears to be isolated in the classroom.
>
> Students allowed to choose own groups to complete a task.
>
> Usually there are no isolates. However, composition of several usual groups has changed. Merrilee and Leanne have emerged as isolates. These two agree to be a group and other groups offer to help them. (There is usually a pleasing degree of intergroup cooperation.) Had opportunity later to ask Jacqui, Merrilee's usual friend, what had happened between them.

"Oh, she's a pain. She wants everything her own way and sulks if she can't get it."

The task was spread over three days. On the first day I spent some time helping Merrilee and Leanne. On days two and three there was a noticeable closing of the gap between Jacqui's and Merrilee's groups.

On day three Merrilee accidently knocked over a bottle of glue which made quite a mess on the floor. She was most upset and in trying to demonstrate to me how it happened the glue bottle slipped out of her hand on to the floor. I assured her that she was not going to get into trouble and began to help her clean up the mess. Jacqui came over and helped with the cleaning.

Next day they sat together in class and were very well behaved. As they were leaving I said,

"I see that you two have patched up your friendship."

They both smiled and said, "We were only pretending not to be friendly just to trick everybody."

I am always surprised at the power that can be generated for the maintenance of ideas and methods of research, and also surprised at how often teachers' journal entries challenge such received opinions. In the case of Merrille's problem, for instance, most of the literature we offer teachers emphasises the importance of peer groups, in spite of the fact that a little read paper by Furlong (1976) shows remarkably clearly that it is not peer groups but 'interaction sets' that are important in classroom situations, and provide an obvious explanation of what puzzled this teacher.

But another structure to be revealed here concerns the notion 'friendship'. Commenting on this incident, the teacher wrote, "Are students' friendships really so changing?". He, like most of us when we talk about friendship, tends to think of it solely in adult terms, without seeing that the term is more a reified function than an autonomous entity. Mackay (1973) makes that point with regard to the term 'socialization', and shows how children are not inadequately or incompletely socialized adults, but are rather fully socially competent within different (i.e.

childhood) social structures. In this incident the teacher is puzzled by the children's friendship behaviour only, because, typically (Davies, 1982), he is normatively comparing it to his own (adult) conceptions. Cosaro (1981) showed that children more often and more overtly than adults, use friendship as a source of coercive power in situations such as defining territory, turn taking and adherence to group behaviour norms.

In that way, this incident indicates something of the structure of the social norms of these children, unknown to the teacher, and, until recently, not recognised in the research. What is interesting about this incident is that I made the above explanation before the supporting research on children's friendships quoted was published. That was not clever: the incident points so directly to that explanation that it was obvious in spite of its contradicting the literature then available. I chose that incident, however, because it has since been shown to be reasonable. Although teachers' journals are full of unorthodox and exceptional entries which are nevertheless real and explicable, here is not the place to discuss the validity of other observations.

Returning to the journal, therefore, it is clear that more journal entries alone cannot answer such questions as those above, so unless this kind of research is going to remain at the low level of "Tell me what to do about this" (Easley, 1978), then something needs to be done by way of cumulation or development of grounded theory.

Journal entries and grounded theory

Again, it is not possible to give a full account of how that might be done, so I will merely show how a journal entry such as the next, could provide a starting point for formally constructed grounded theory.

Sonia	Mr Hopkins, Paul hasn't ruled his page properly.
Me	Look Sonia, just get on with your own work.
Paul	Mr Hopkins, Sonia keeps nudging me each time I try to rule up.
Me	C'mon you two, just settle down, it's only five past nine.

***

This carries on for most of the rest of the morning between Sonia and Paul with me trying to placate. I think to myself, "How can I stop this?" 'IDEA'

***

Sonia	Mr Hopkins, Paul keeps looking at my work.
Me	(Looking at Sonia's work) That shouldn't make any difference, you haven't done anything yet! (Addressing both Paul and Sonia). Now that's enough from you two. If I hear any more tales today you'll write them out 10 times.

***

I think to myself, "Are they just attention seeking or are they really so incompatible?"

***

Sonia	Mr Hopkins, Paul's ripping pages out of his reading book.
Me	What! Show me Paul!
Paul	It was an accident Mr Hopkins.
Me	Well, if you can't get it fixed tonight you'll have to replace it.
Paul	Okay Mr Hopkins.
Me	First group ready can go to afternoon recess.
Paul	Will Sonia have to stay in for telling tales on me?
Me	No!
Paul	But you said ....
Me	Never mind!
Paul	(To Sonia) You get away with everything!
Sonia	I do not!

(Exit arguing. To be continued, no doubt!)

This is very powerful. It is a good example of the way in which students can manipulate to their own advantage the autopilot routines and other structures which teachers set up to enable their classrooms to run efficiently. In this case, the teacher places himself in a double bind which the students are quick to

exploit. The whole problem with tale telling is that it impinges on the power relationship between the pupils themselves, between the pupils (as individuals and a group) and the teacher. There are a number of very complex checks and balances which must operate and be maintained. Teachers want to know what is happening in the class, but cannot know everything all of the time, so to a certain extent they must rely on information about students provided to them by students. However, students are in competition with one another in the kind of ways which Hargreaves (1972) suggested as the basic rules of doing well in class:

> First law: find out what pleases and displeases the teacher.
>
> Second law: bring to the teacher's attention those things which please the teacher and conceal from him those behaviours which will displease him.
>
> Third law: remember that it is a competitive situation. The pupil must try to please the teacher and avoid displeasing him more than other pupils.

Pupils also know things such as that teachers like particular children more than other children, and that there is a tendency for them to favour the children they like. So how do children and teachers find and maintain the necessary delicate dynamic balance between giving to the teacher and receiving from the pupils the information the teacher wants, without pupils being ostracized by peers because they are trying to curry favour with the teacher, and not upsetting the teacher by giving too much, too little, or the wrong kind of information? How does the teacher find the balance between encouraging children to provide the necessary information, and between being seen to have favourites who always help, without being annoyed by the constant oversupply of the wrong kind of information because the criteria of value are so subtle and covert?

Clearly there are very complex rules which I certainly cannot articulate at present, and which, once again, I have not seen spelled out by any research. In this case, Mr Hopkins clearly has some kind of taxonomy about what constitutes

undesired information which is therefore termed "tale telling", and what constitutes useful information which significantly goes unnamed. The way in which the children manage to force the teacher into a position of having to break his word is very clever, and indicates just how good is their grasp of the situation. They know that tearing pages out of reading books is a qualitatively different act from looking at someone else's work. It is apparent, however, that the teacher is making such distinctions unconciously, or he would have been able to explain to the students why he did not consider this information to be "tale telling". It was a simple matter, (once he had revealed what was happening to himself from his own observations), for this teacher to deal with the immediate problem of how his lack of clarity and awareness about tale telling was a cause of the pupils' exploration of this matter. It was also possible to raise with him questions about why it was that he had never had to clarify the matter, and how the incident was indicative of the particular power structures in his classroom relations. How, then, could this entry be theorized?

Grounded theory refers, of course, to Glaser and Strauss' (1967) work on the generation of theory directly from data, which they contrast with the use of data to verify theory. They see all data as being theory laden, and hence the use of 'discovery' in their title. The method they outline and illustrate in their book, basically consists of recognising categories and the properties of theose categories in order to develop hypotheses, the bounds of the truth of which may then be established and accounted for, thereby producing what they term a 'substantive theory', though 'local theory' (Schibeci and Grundy, 1986) is now my preferred term. That theory is then clarified, elaborated, assessed and generalised through largely comparative processes, before being applied to different situations in different ways.

Although it is quite beyond the scope of this paper to follow those steps with regard to the above journal entry, it should be possible to see how, as a datum, it is ideally suited to be dealt with in that way. In the entry we already have the category 'tale telling' and several of its properties, such as the pupil-to-teacher-about-pupil relationship, and the magnitude of event as a teacher criterion. In more theoretical terms, we can see how the pupils use over-compliance as a form of resistance, which is locked into the bounds of this instance, and is hence substantive at this stage. But over-compliance is also likely to be latently or overtly present in a number of other aspects of this and other classrooms, and furthermore, in many other social situations, such as the workplace. As such, it has obvious potential for development into a more wide-ranging formal theory of the kind suggested by Glaser and Strauss.

Journal entries as exemplifications of theory

Moving in the other direction, so to speak, from theory to data, teacher journal entries are often exemplifications of well theorised notions, even if the theories are generally those of other disciplines such as sociology or psychology merely applied to educational situations. Consider the following entry which is potentially well informed by sociological theory:

> We had been working on manners. I had suggested a few very basic ones, the first of which was knocking before entering the room. To encourage the pupils I had a daily "Good Manners Award".
>
> After lunch on the day we started it, the first visitor was the Head. He just walked into our room to check on something (irrelevant) and Chris yelled out, "He can't get our award. He didn't knock on the door, or wait till you had finished speaking." How true. The kids thought they were wonderful picking someone up, but he didn't seem to appreciate it all that much as I did.
>
> He shuffled out of the room and left me to explain that perhaps we should wait until the visitor leaves the room before we comment on their manners.

An amusing incident, though one which caused both teacher and principal some embarrassment. It is interesting how often, as soon as an apparently simple rule is set up to follow in school, the rule merely proves the world to be more complicated than anticipated. In this case, the teacher did not allow for the fact that "good manners" does not mean that everyone behaves in the same way. Manners are primarily codes by which we express status, and are thus contingent upon power relationships. Doing or not doing something does not always mean it is good or bad manners, but depends upon the people and the context.

Manners are a constantly repeated concern of teachers, but because there is no substantial and commonly available research on how children learn manners in different settings, or on how they may be taught, this entry on its own is difficult to analyse much further. All that we do know is that there is a nexus between privacy and intimacy in which the amount of privacy we are given or can take depends upon the context and the degree of intimacy in the relationships; and in the school context, the degree of intimacy depends upon status, bestowed by institutional role, which is hence a feature of power. This is clear when one considers that the principal may go anywhere in the school without knocking or waiting to speak, the teachers may go into most rooms in the school without knocking (though not into the principal's study) and generally wait to speak, and the pupils may go almost nowhere without knocking and must wait to be asked to speak. We do not know much about what markers of power there are in our schools, how they support or contradict each other, to whom and in what ways they are beneficial or harmful, or whether they are procedures and things which teachers could and should operate upon.

Similarly, this next should be, though I don't believe it actually is, informed by psychology:

> From beginning to end of the day I kept repeating myself. I often think I'm just talking to myself, no one else appears to listen. Are my

> instructions concise and clear enough for the children to understand? Maybe I should only give any instructions when it's not obvious to the kids what they have to do, or is repetition necessary, because through repetition they finally get it?

Clearly there is almost a superfluity of literature under the general umbrella term of learning theory that should enable this teacher to answer her questions. But this journal entry demonstrates very clearly that the problem is that classrooms are quite different places to the laboratories in which most of the learning research has been performed, and researchers, so far as I have discovered from my relatively limited and inexpert reading, have not devoted time or effort to matters concerning how teachers gain pupils' attention in such a way as to ensure their retention of managerial instructions in classrooms: the vast majority of the work has been on the structuring of substantive information for learning. As I have unsuccessfully argued elsewhere (Tripp, 1984), one cannot merely "apply" essentially psychological findings to traditional classroom settings: what is necessary is a whole restructuring or transformation of information and understandings gained in one situation before they are relevant or even true in another (see Barnes, 1982).

Not having ready-made answers, however, does not render such an entry valueless. On the contrary, with regard to teacher development, it provides not a basis upon which to probe this teacher's practice in such a way that she can begin to produce her own answers. Furthermore, and with regard to curriculum, it also indicates to a researcher such as myself some useful and interesting directions to persue. For both this teacher's and my work, we must first focus and zoom in on her instructions to provide a far clearer and more detailed picture of what does actually happen in her classroom. We first need to answer her question, "Are my instructions concise and clear enough?" We also need to find out and describe for others the context and conditions under which she is giving instructions, and to think of alternative ways of accounting for the children's demands for repetition.

Not only would such activities help her improve her practice, but it would all be useful data for my work.

Journal entries, cumulation and generalisation

Kennedy, (1979), has suggested that the comparison of cases, or the direct application of one case to another, is the most appropriate form of what Stake (1978) referred to as 'naturalistic generalisation'. Each journal entry, in some senses, constitutes a case (or a 'bounded instance' at any rate), and as such it is often useful to generalise them in that way. Although (at present and so far as I know), I am working alone on this, it is surprising how often patterns of topic or concern seem to emerge. It is not difficult to envisage the systematic cumulation of journal entries, and a research industry accumulating around an archive of the kind suggested by Stenhouse (1978). Consider, for instance the following entry made by another teacher in a very different situation to the last.

> I had just finished reading 'Of Mice and Men' aloud to the class. I'd serialised it and been reading it aloud to the group. I allowed a few minutes at the very end when I said nothing, allowing the tragedy to work its magic, and for some students to recover their composure, and yet others to talk in order to relieve the tension and perhaps discuss the book. Then I asked each one to write something in the form of a journal entry about the response to the book as a whole, or to the characters etc. I reiterated the characteristics of the journal (the freedom from formal constraints, the individual and idiosyncratic tone, the personal voice etc.); I added my reason for asking them to write in this mode. I finished by asking if anyone had any questions. There was a pause and then Ross's hand went up "What do you want us to do, sir"? All the time I'd been talking he'd been looking at me, apparently listening. I didn't yell. Didn't respond in the time-honoured way: rhetorical questions and sarcasm. Without moving into another register, without being dismissive or curt, I explained again about writing a journal entry. It may be a little bizarre but I wondered why he had asked his question. Did he want more guidance than I wanted to give? Was he hoping that by my reformulating my demands he might come to guess my intention more accurately (even though I thought I had explained why he was doing what he was doing!)?

My experience in trying to cumulate entries is that two very similar entries seldom seem to explain or account for each other obviously or directly. The major similarity of the last two entries is that in both the teachers seem puzzled and

annoyed by children's requests for them to repeat the instructions they have just given. Otherwise, differences predominate: one is general, the other particular; one primary children, the other secondary; one routine, the other an exception, and so on. They do not even seem to both fit the most obvious explanation that springs to mind, namely inadequate attention given by pupils, so the two entries seem to require quite different explanations. It may be that in the first case the teacher does ensure that she has the attention of all the pupils before she gives an instruction; but in the second, if the teacher is correct in his belief that the pupil was attending and that his instructions were clear, it is probable that the pupil has not retained or understood the connection between the topic and the task, which the teacher has dealt with serially and at length. Nevertheless, the two incidents do inform each other in that such a process of contrast and comparison is a means whereby that which is found in one can be checked out in the other.

Surprisingly, however, such comparison of like with like (Ortony's (1979) 'literal similarity') does not seem to yield as much information or insight as the comparison of two apparently unconnected entries (Ortony's 'metaphorical similarity'). We know very little as yet about this latter kind of generalisation, though it is possible to illustrate the way in which it seems to work. As a brief example, here is another entry which is apparently entirely unconnected with either of the last two in that it was made about copying in a secondary social studies class:

> I asked the pupils to answer some questions from their existing knowledge before reading a section of the text. But they just copied out answers from the text book. When I asked them why, many students said that they copied from the book for fear of getting the answer wrong.

Contextually different as it is when we compare this entry with the previous two, it seems to offer a possible alternative explanation for both: with regard to the

first, it may be that the teacher has become caught in a vicious circle in which, because she repeats instructions so often, they have become very salient and significant features of her teaching, and hence to the children, who have become over-anxious about doing exactly what she has told them to do, and so they are constantly asking for reassurance by checking that they know what she said. In the latter, it may be that the pupil was similarly afraid of doing the wrong thing for some reason, such as that he did not really believe that the teacher actually meant what he said when he emphasised the new freedom he was offering to them in terms of their writing, or because he simply needed reassurance before attempting something new. In both comparisons, transformation of the 'odd' case has been necessary, so that 'fear of getting the answer wrong' became 'fear of doing the wrong thing'. In terms of exemplification, those two explanations are subsumed by the single category 'student anxiety', which in itself is a powerful concept, the use of which is yet another kind of generalisation.

Although I have written elsewhere about case to case generalisation in terms of literal similarity (Tripp, 1985), it now seems to me that, contrary to other paradigms in which generalisations are made by a process of cumulating data which are alike in all but a few dependent or controlled variables, in naturalistic generalisation, forcing metaphorical comparisons, making transformations and exemplifying concepts, is a more profitable strategy to adopt.

Journal entries and researcher analysis

Although journal entries are generally analysed by the journalist in the first instance, it should be clear by now that they always provide a very rich ground for the researcher to analyse also. Readers often see quite different things in the writing to the actual authors, and also to other readers. In the last entry, for instance, there are implications for students' 'meta-learning' (Lundgren, 1981): it

appears that they place more value on getting the right answer than on generating or understanding it. If the students had thought up their own answer, or even put the answer in the book in their own words, whether they got it correct or not would have indicated to them whether they had understood it properly or not. But the act of copying the words out not only insures that they get it "right", it also obviates understanding their answer. So at a deeper level, the meaning of what the students are saying, is in fact that knowing whether they understand it or not, is, at the least secondary to getting it right, at the most totally unimportant or irrelevant to them. As an instance of the hidden curriculum in terms of learning about school learning, this observation illustrates the fact that how these students respond to questions is primarily determined by expectations gained from how the lesson is run, not upon their knowledge or ability.

Once the researcher and the teacher making that observation have got to that kind of point, it is then necessary to formulate some further questions that could be answered by futher, more focussed and systematic observation. In this case, the question that interested me was whether the students did really want to get it right in order to get good marks, or some other reward; or whether they merely wanted to avoid the hard work involved in gaining an understanding of the information that they were reading but were not prepared to offer that as an explanation to the teacher. I suspect that the answer would turn out to be that it is a bit of both, but whether different students perceive the task differently, or whether students perceive that one can get something right without undertanding it, and whether they think that matters, are all questions that are useful to a teacher to have answers for, as well as being questions which would help the students to learn about their own learning, and hence to be more active in it. Thus, once again, partnership in a journal entry has value for both the teacher and curriculum research.

Journal entries as curriculum and instruction

To this point it may seem that I have not yet tied traditional conceptions of curriculum as material and methods of instruction to journals. Although the connection has not been articulated as such, nevertheless it should be apparent that much of the discussion of the examples of journal entries given thus far is clearly about curriculum in the sense that it is about what is being taught and learned. However, teachers do often write entries in which their own focus is on their concerns with methods or the overt teaching substance.

> This (the library) period always leaves me frustrated. The children really don't have enough time to browse and really choose their books.

or

> Students preparing a chart showing the different stages in the growing of sugar cane...Many made the mistake of listing the details of a description of a stage as other stages in the growth of the plant: e.g. Planting the cane: the planting machine cuts the long cane into short lengths...coats them with fungicide...as they are dropped into a furrow. Problems with conception of time.

From a facilitory point of view such entries, though they are (if taken at face value) apparently so mundane, matter of fact, and even trivial, raise problems which not only need to be dealt with because they are pressing problems requiring intervention in the contexts in which they occur, but also because they have general implications for other areas of teaching, such as timetabling, cognitive level, clarity of task exposition, and so on. Furthermore, these entries raise the usual crop of questions about the teacher's interpretations of the incidents, their values and the hidden curriculum. In both of these senses, such entries are about curriculum in the traditional sense of subject matter and method of instruction.

Entries such as the next, however, impinge not only upon the substance being taught, but also on the notion of curriculum as defined earlier in this paper. In

fact, that definition was developed precisely because the kinds of question raised by this entry are not seen as legitimate curriculum matters in narrower definitions.

> Waste. Whilst on duty I have noticed fairly frequently one girl continually putting her food into the bin. The child looks around to see if anyone is watching and if not, quickly pops the lunch into the bin. The first few times the incident was overlooked or ignored but it being constantly repeated is causing me concern. The child is clearly being "sneaky", so the problem is how to correct the whole situation rather than just make her devise more sneaky methods of lunch disposal.
>
> Action. A lesson on the importance and care of food was given in today's social studies lesson. Groups were set up to discuss amongst other things, wastage of food. The child in question was made a group leader to report group's findings. Her group's findings sounded very convincing but must wait now for practical outcome.

Looking at this entry first in terms of this teacher's theories of teaching we find that she believes that behaviour is affected by values, and that values are affected by knowledge; that teachers can and ought to transmit values; that transmission is best achieved through peer group exposition; that children can be left to find their own solutions. Leaving aside the irrationality of the idea that if a child eats food, they are thereby not wasting it, the implication of this teacher's strategy is that children are simply naughty about certain things on certain occasions: that is, they do naughty things because they are naughty, not because they have good reasons for doing what adults might term "naughtiness". Discussing this entry with the teacher concerned, it became clear that, although at one level she was merely reporting what she was doing, at another she was disquited about it, and had written it down because she needed to reflect upon it. It was for her a disorientating dilemma of the kind that Mezirow (1981) suggests are a necessary precondition for critical self-examination.

What she could not see by herself and at that time, was that there were excellent reasons as to why she was not entirely happy about the incident. Analysing it we found that she was in fact in a curiously contradictory, and hence uncomfortable, position: at one and the same time she seemed to regard her changing the child's behaviour through the indirect imposition of her values via rational exposition as being preferable to changing the child's behavior by direct intervention (such as investigating why the child is throwing her food away, and changing that), yet she expected the child to change her behaviour herself as a result of her knowing that wasting food is bad. Her teaching decision was internally contradictory, but it was so because people often behave in contradictory ways when they are undergoing a process of change: they know what they are trying to do, but cannot always manage to do it.

Thus, contrary to the negative impression that one might have received from first reading of the entry, this is not a picture of an unthinking teacher who seems to have misread the situation; it is a picture of a thinking teacher who (a) is sufficiently concerned about what she is doing to commit it to her journal, and (b) has become confused because she is trying to redirect her approach. She adopted the strategy she did for reasons such as that she did not want to embarass the child in front of her peers; that she wanted to offer the child the opportunity to make up her own mind, rather than simply being told; she did not want to make it a disciplinary matter, perhaps involving the parents and others; and so on. As Schwab reminded us earlier, teachers have to take hundreds of decisions of such complexity every day, and just how they balance one factor against another not only springs directly from their values via their "intuition", but will aso reflect contradictions existing within and between those values.

In this case, there was a school rule that children must eat their own lunch, and not swap or dispose of it, so the compulsion to be a good teacher and enforce

the rules, was as strong as the sedimented value that eating everything that you were given to eat, even when it was more than you wanted, was good use of food; and these also conflicted with a desire to enable the child responsibly and independently to transfer knowledge from formal learning to her own behaviour.

The point of this example is not simply that enabling a teacher to see the kind of binds and conflicts that they are in enables them to act upon them; not that such incidents are growth nodes in terms of a critical understanding of how teaching is socially and historically situated; nor that such matters require research and theorisation; such points have already been made. The point of this example is that, as so often, the teacher's perception of the incident directly determined her structuring of a formal learning situation, and the articulation of her perception of the incident in her journal and our discussion of it, directly affected the way in which she would approach the structuring of formal learning about other values in the future. How and why that happened is surely a central concern for curriculum in almost any definition of the term.

I therefore suggest that to argue the importance of such outcomes is not to deviate from the matter of curriculum research to teacher education. One of the strengths of the journal is that in it public educational research and personal professional development are placed in a symbiotic relationship. What we have is a participant's subjective account, and in naturalistic research it is essential "to treat people as if they were human beings...(that is)...to accept their commentaries upon their actions as authentic, though revisable, reports of phenomena subject to empirical criticism" (Hamilton & Delamont, 1975). More recently, how one treats participants' accounts has been discussed in terms of the power relationships between informants and researchers, and some strategies aimed at enhancing authenticity have been suggested (Lather, 1984; Tripp, 1983). But because I want to concentrate upon what can be done with the data

rather than how it is collected, I do not want to dwell upon the implications of that issue here. Instead I am assuming that it is the case that the journal accounts of teachers are data about how they are perceiving or thinking about their practice. These data are similar in kind and function to the thinking aloud routines employed particularly in some forms of cognitive research, such as problem solving and information processing. It should be clear, that in the above example, the teacher is not only going through a process of personal development, she is also providing some much needed empirical evidence about issues such as the lone(ly) subject in critical professional practice (Grundy & Kemmis, 1981) which thus far had been largely addressed merely analyticaly (Habermas, 1974). Thus such an example not only connects the concrete practice of a teacher to abstract notions of social theory directly, but it also establishes connections between teaching and sociology within an emergent field of curriculum theory.

Conclusion

If this paper has a single message, it is that although teachers may have been slow to change their teaching styles and to adopt new curricula, curriculum researchers, with far less excuse, have been even more slow to learn from teachers, and time may yet prove them to be the real curriculum specialists. One stock excuse has been that teachers, precisely because they are such expert practitioners, can do brilliantly, but are largely unable to explain in a formal theoretical or academic way, how or why they do it. Tacit and procedural knowledge is always difficult to articulate in a public and scientific fashion, but that it has proved difficult should not deter the attempt to the extent that it seems to have done. So I have here attempted to offer one strategy for collaboratively researching teachers' practical knowledge. I am aware that the use of professional research journals by practising teachers is relatively recent,

and therefore that in discussing them we are dealing more with possibilities and potentials than with actual achievements in the sense of a corpus of literature and a tradition of research which has yielded well known and useful insights. But that should only make such work more profitable, original and exciting.

Within the scope of a conference presentation, I have tried to illustrate my approach to journals, necessarily merely gesturing at the kind of way in which the entries can be used, rather than treating each one fully. Nevertheless I make no apology for so doing. The value of journals in teacher education is becoming accepted, and I believe that it is important to place journals as a strategy for learning from teachers on the agenda for discussion, experimentation and development in the area of curriculum research also. In that regard, in construing curriculum as a field of research on teaching as a specific social practice, I hope to have shown that the perception of that practice by individual teachers, addressing essentially procedural problems, could and ought to draw upon and contribute to formal and public theoretical knowledge, not only of curriculum, but also of education and other disciplines. The importance of journals in those processes is that they provide a means for teachers to set their own agendas for curriculum knowledge. It is in addressing their agenda that individual teachers have to move beyond the bounds of their own private and immediate practical concerns to include the terrain of the public, social and theoretical in their deliberations. Similarly, researchers learn from teachers when they are forced to confront and engage with the reality of individual teachers' private practice. Teachers and researchers thereby become partners in a collaborative learning endeavour to develop the curriculum field.

References

Barnes, B. T.S. Kuhn and Social Science. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Bassey, M. 'Crocodiles eat Children'. Classroom Action Research Network, 1980, 4, 16-35

Berlak, A. & H. Berlak. Dilemmas of schooling. London: Methuen, 1981.

Bogdan, R. A., & S. J. Taylor, Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods, 1975, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Boomer, G. Struggling in English. English in Australia, 1984, 59, 3-10.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. Becoming critical: Knowing through action research Geelong: Deakin Uni. Press, 1983.

Cherryholmes, C. N. Theory and practice: On the role of empirically based theory for critical practice. American Journal of Education 1985 (Nov), 39-70.

Connell, R. W. Teachers' Work, Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1985.

Corey, S. M. Action research, fundamental research and educational practice. Teachers' College Record, 1949, 50, 509-514.

Cosaro, W. A. Friendship in the nursery school: social organisation in a peer environment. In Asher, S. R. & J. M. Gottman The Development of Children's Friendships. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1981.

Davies, B. Life in the classroom and playground, London: R. & K.P., 1982.

Denzin, N. K. The research act: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods, Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

Easley, J. A. Some methodological issues in research circulated towards problems of teachers. A talk given to the Committee on Culture and Education, October 30th, 1978. Mimeo from the author at CIRCE, Uni. Illinois.

Elliott, J., Adleman, C. et al. The Ford teaching project. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Education, 1976.

Fensham, P., C. Power, D. Tripp. and S. Kemmis, Alienation from Schooling. London; R & K.P., 1986.

Furlong, V.J. Interaction sets in the classroom: Towards a study of pupil knowledge. Explorations in Classroom Observation. Stubbs, M. & S. Delamont (Eds). Chichester: Wiley, 1976, 23-44

Giroux, H. A. Pedagogy, Pessimism, and the politics of conformity: A reply to Linda McNeil, Curriculum Inquiry, 1981, 11(3), 211-222.

Giroux, H. Schooling and the myth of objectivity: stalking the politics of the hidden curriculum. McGill Journal of Education, 1981, XCVI, 3, 282-304.

Giroux, H. Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition. Hadley, mass: Bergin & Garvey, 1983.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies of qualitative research. Weidenfield and Nicholson, 1967.

Goodson, I. & Ball, S. (eds) Defining the curriculum, London: Falmer Press, 1985.

Gough, N. the practical in curriculum theorizing. Curriculum Perspectives 1984, 4, 1.

Grundy, S. & S. Kemmis Educational action research in Australia: The state of the art (an overview). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Adelaide, November, 1981.

Habermas, J. Knowledge and Human Interest, London: Heinemann, 1972.

Habermas, J. Theory and practice (trans. J. Viertel), London: Heinemann, 1974.

Hamilton, D. & Delamont S. Classroom research: A cautionary tale, Research in Education, 1974, 11, 1-5.

Hargreaves, D. Interpersonal Relations and Education (Revised Ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.

Jackson, P. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Kennedy, M. M. Generalizing from single case studies, Evaluation Quarterly, 1979, 3, 661-678.

Lather, P. Research as Praxis. Paper presented at the Sixth Curriculum Theorizing Conference, Bergamo Center, Dayton, Ohio, November 1984. (M.S. available from the author at Mankato State university, Mankato, MN 56001.

Lewin, K. Action research and minority problems. Journals of Social Issues, 1946, 2, 34-36.

Lundgren, U. Education as a context for work. Opening address to the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, 1980. Australian Educational Researcher, 1981, 8 (2), 5-29.

Mackay, R.W. Conceptions of children and models of socialisation, in H.P. Dreitzel (ed.) Recent Sociology No. 5., London: Macmillan. Revised in R. Turner, Ethnomethodology, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1974.

Marsh C. & K. Stafford, Curriculum: Australian practices and issues, Sydney: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Mezirow, J. A critical theory of adult learning and education, Adult Education, 1981, 32, 3-24.

Ortony, A. Beyond literal similarity. Psychological Review, 1979, 6(3), 161-180.

Pinar, W. & M. Grumet, Theory and practice and the reconceptualisation of curriculum studies, in M. Lawn and L. Barton, Rethinking Curriculum Studies, London: Crom Helm, 1981.

Stake, R.E. "The case study method in social inquiry". Educational Researcher, 1978, 5-8.

Schwab, J.J. The practical 4: something for curriculum professors to do. Curriculum Inquiry, 1983, 13(3), 240-265.

Stenhouse, L. Case records as an archival resource for educational research: an inter-institutional programme. Proposal to S.S.R.C., 1978. Mimeo from C.A.R.E., University of East Anglia, Norfolk, U.K.

Stenhouse, L. Defining the curriculum problem. In Hamilton, D. et al. 1977, Beyond the numbers game. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Tripp, D.H. Co-authorship and negotiation: The interview as art of creation. Interchange, 1983, 14(3), 32-45.

Tripp, D.H. From autopilot to critical consciousness: problematising successful teaching. Paper presented at the Bergamo Conference of the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, Dayton, Ohio, 1984.

Tripp, D.H. Cinderella curriculum and the sibling disciplines. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Perth, Nov. 1984, and rejected by Curriculum Inquiry. Mimeo from the author at Murdoch University, W.A., 1984(b).

Tripp, D.H. Case study generalisation: An agenda for action. British Educational Research Journal, 1985, 11(1), 33-43.

Tripp, D.H. Theorising teaching: an empirical approach for practitioners, Deakin University (in press) 1986.

Walker, R. Doing research, London: Methuen, 1985.

Webb, E., Campbell, T., Schwartz, R., Sechrest, R., Unobtrusive Measures: Non-reactive Research in the Social Sciences, Rand McNally, 1966.

Westbury & Steiner (198) Curriculum and discipline in search of its problems, School Review, 79, 243-267.

Westbury, I. and Steiner, W. Curriculum: A discipline in search of its problems. School Review, 1971, 79, 243-267.

Woods, P. Teacher, self and curriculum. In I. Goodson and S. Ball, 1985, 237-262, Op. cit).

Many thanks to Ivor Goodson for his comments on a draft of this manuscript.